

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

21 May 1981

NOTE FOR: Art

FROM: Moe

RE: Review of NFIP Support to Contingency
Forces During the FY 1983-1987
Program Review

1. Attached is [] note on
contingency forces task as called for in []
21 May MFR.

25X1
25X1

2. Next step is to approach []
[] for support (either you or I can do that).

25X1

3. If you are planning to approach PBO
or PGS for support, you may want to meet with
Pat, John, and me to further illuminate the
issue.

m.

Moe

cc:

[]

Attachment

INFORMATION

Review of NFIP Support to Contingency Forces
During the FY 1983-1987 Program Review

1. Background

The DCI's FY 1983-1987 Program Guidance included a number of items derived from last year's study and program issue paper on NFIP Support to Contingency Forces. The CCP, CIAP, and GDIP Program Managers were asked to include in their Program Submissions initiatives to improve contingency support in specific problem areas highlighted in the study, and to provide assessments of how each package submitted would improve current capabilities. In addition, the GDIP Program Manager was asked to provide a progress report on non-resource related topics for which DIA had the lead. We, in turn, committed RMS, via guidance, to prepare a report by 15 June 1981 summarizing "those important resource initiatives in each program for improving contingency force support in the FY 1983-1987 program period."

2. Alternatives for Program Review

Given the emphasis placed on contingency support in guidance, we should begin considering the type of program review paper that can be prepared. I think the paper should:

- Summarize the resource initiatives proposed by each program;
- Attempt to identify strategies for combining packages into logical groupings, each aimed at a major problem area identified in last year's study; and
- Structure alternatives based on these groupings for DCI program decisions.

The level of effort required to prepare such a paper depends on the author's familiarity with military support and how much he tries to update the problem areas from last year's study to latest concerns in the RDJTF, etc. At a minimum, the author should:

- Review the contingency study and program issue paper from last year;
- Review what was funded in the FY 1981 amendment and the FY 1982 supplemental;
- Read the FY 1983-1987 program submissions to identify contingency related packages; and
- Prepare the proposed paper.

This approach would require one person, working 3/4 time from about 10 June through 15 July.

Additional tasks, which would likely produce a better paper, would include:

- Informally contacting the CCP, CIAP, and GDIP program offices before 15 June to get a preview of what we are likely to receive in this area so the author can start structuring the paper now; and
- Coordination with analysts in DoD participating in the response to the Allen memo to ensure there is no unnecessary duplication of effort, and to see if they have identified any changes in the problem areas discussed in our study last year.

It is estimated that this more ambitious approach would require one person working 3/4 time from about 1 June through 15 July.